

DEC 28 2007

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ISAGANI ALMONTE CORONEL; GAIL
ABARRO CORONEL,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY,** Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 06-74881

Agency Nos. A75-725-246
A75-725-249

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted December 20, 2007***

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** Michael B. Mukasey is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R. Gonzales, as Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 43(c)(2).

*** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Isagani Almonte Coronel and Gail Abarro Coronel seek review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) affirming an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) order denying their applications for cancellation of removal. We dismiss the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review the agency’s discretionary determination that petitioners failed to show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to a qualifying relative. *See Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 887, 892 (9th Cir. 2003).

Petitioners’ contentions that the IJ and BIA violated their due process rights by disregarding their evidence of hardship does not amount to a colorable constitutional claim. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005) (“[T]raditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction.”).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.